

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 12-15, 17, 18 and 21-24 are presently pending. Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 17 and 21 and cancelled claims 4 and 8 herein. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Applicant has amended the claims to more succinctly claim particular aspects of the invention. Support for the amendments is found in the specification and in the original claims. Accordingly, applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced by the amendments.

Claims 1-2, 4, 12-15, 17, 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Dietz et al. (USPN 6,642,717).

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites in part: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles is 0.1% or less of a volume of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue."

Dietz et al. is directed to a magnetic resonance apparatus. However, Dietz et al., does not provide any teaching of: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles is 0.1% or less of a volume of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue", as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. does not teach each and every limitation of claim 1, as amended, applicant submits that claim 1, and claim 2 which depends from claim 1 are allowable over this reference.

Independent claim 12 recites in part: "the potting compound layer having a plurality of conductive particles configured to limit a current flowing through the potting compound layer to less than a predetermined current value to reduce electrostatic discharges in the potting compound layer, the plurality of conductive particles being at least one of silver particles and gold particles."

Dietz et al. does not provide any teaching of utilizing silver and gold conductive particles in a potting compound layer as recited in claim 12.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. does not teach each and every limitation of claim 12, applicant submits that claim 12 is allowable over this reference.

Independent claim 13, as amended, recites in part: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles is 0.1% or less of a volume of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue."

Dietz et al., however, does not provide any teaching of: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles is 0.1% or less of a volume of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue", as recited in claim 13 as amended.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. does not teach each and every limitation of claim 13, as amended, applicant submits that claim 13, and claims 14, 15 and 17 which depend from claim 13, are allowable over this reference.

Independent claim 21 recites in part: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles being within a predetermined volume percentage range of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue."

Dietz et al., however, does not provide any teaching of: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles being within a predetermined volume percentage range of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue", as recited in claim 21 as amended.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. does not teach each and every limitation of claim 21, as amended, applicant submits that claim 21, and claim 22 which depends from claim 21, are allowable over this reference.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz et al. (USPN 6,642,717) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Doty (USPN 5,530,355).

Claim 3 depends from claim 1, as amended, and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, Dietz et al. does not teach: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles is 0.1% or less of a volume of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue", as recited in claim 1 as amended. Further, Doty does not teach the foregoing limitations of claim 1 as amended.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. and Doty, alone or in combination, do not teach each and every limitation of claim 1, as amended, and claim 3 which depends from claim 1, applicant submits that claim 3 is allowable over these references.

Claims 5 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz et al. (USPN 6,642,717) as applied to claims 2 and 22 above, and further in view of Lehne et al. (USPN 5,235,283).

Claim 5 depends from claim 1, as amended, and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, Dietz et al. does not teach: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles is 0.1% or less of a volume of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue", as recited in claim 1 as amended. Further, Lehne et al. does not teach the foregoing limitations of claim 1 as amended.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. and Lehne et al., alone or in combination, do not teach each and every limitation of claim 1, as amended, and claim 5 which depends from claim 1, applicant submits that claim 5 is allowable over these references.

Claim 23 depends from claim 21, as amended, and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 21. Claim 21, as amended, recites in part: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles being within a predetermined volume percentage range of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue." After carefully reviewing Dietz et al. and Lehne et al., neither reference teaches the foregoing limitations of claim 21 as amended.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. and Lehne et al., alone or in combination, do not teach each and every limitation of claim 21, as amended, and claim 23 which depends from claim 21, applicant submits that claim 23 is allowable over these references.

Claims 6-8, 18 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dietz et al. (USPN 6,642,717) as applied to claims 1, 17 and 21 above, and further in view of Wang et al. (Pub. No. 2004/0225213).

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1, as amended, and therefore incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1. As discussed above, Dietz et al. does not teach: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles is 0.1% or less of a volume of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue", as recited in claim 1 as amended. Further, Wang et al. does not teach the foregoing limitations of claim 1 as amended.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. and Wang et al., alone or in combination, do not teach each and every limitation of claim 1, as amended, and claims 6 and 7 which depend from claim 1, applicant submits that claims 6 and 7 are allowable over these references.

Claim 18 depends from claim 13, as amended, and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 13. As discussed above, Dietz et al., does not provide any teaching of: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles is 0.1% or less of a volume of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to

less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue", as recited in claim 13 as amended. Further, Wang et al. does not teach the foregoing limitations of claim 13 as amended.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. and Wang et al., alone or in combination, do not teach each and every limitation of claim 13, as amended, and claim 18 which depends from claim 13, applicant submits that claim 18 is allowable over these references.

Claim 24 depends from claim 21, as amended, and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 21. Claim 21 as amended, recites in part: "a volume percentage of the plurality of conductive particles being within a predetermined volume percentage range of the conductive compound such that a current flowing through the conductive compound is limited to less than 10 microamps to reduce electrostatic discharges in the glue." After carefully reviewing Dietz et al. and Wang et al., neither reference teaches the foregoing limitation of claim 21 as amended.

Accordingly, because Dietz et al. and Wang et al., alone or in combination, do not teach each and every limitation of claim 21, as amended, and claim 24 which depends from claim 21, applicant submits that claim 24 is allowable over these references.

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Such action is most earnestly solicited. If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with applicant's attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below for an interview.

139773

If there are any charges due with respect to this response document or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 07-0845.

Respectfully Submitted,
CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By /JohnFBuckert/
John F. Buckert
Registration No. 44,572

Date: July 15, 2008
Cantor Colburn, LLP
248-524-2300 ext. 3109
248-524-2700 (fax)